

**WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT  
DELEGATED REPORT**

**APPLICATION No:** 6/2015/2051/EM

**SITE ADDRESS:** 27 Archers Ride, Welwyn Garden City, AL7 4PR

**DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT:** Removal and repositioning of hedge

---

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL**

---

**1. SITE AND APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:**

The application site is located to the north of Archer's Ride and comprises of a two storey mid terrace dwelling. The front is set back from the highway and includes hardstanding and boundary treatment hedgerow to the front and a timber fence to the side along the shared boundary line with no. 25 Archers Ride. The immediate streetscene is residential in character with properties similar in size and design to the host property. The host dwelling is finished in a white painted render, pitched roof and concrete tiles.

The application seeks estate management consent for the repositioning of a hedge at the front of the property.

**2. SITE DESIGNATION:**

The site lies within the Estate Management Scheme area under the Leasehold Reform Act 1967.

**3. EMS HISTORY:**

None

**4. CONSULTATIONS:**

None

**5. NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS:**

No representations have been received from the public.

**6. POLICIES**

Estate Management Scheme (EMS) Policies (October 2008):

EM3 – Soft Landscaping

**7. ANALYSIS**

The main issue is:

- 1. Whether the proposal maintains and enhances the amenities and values of Welwyn Garden City and neighbouring occupiers**

### **EM3 – Soft Landscaping**

The removal of excessive areas or prominent landscaping such as trees and hedges can over time erode character. Accordingly, the council will only allow hard surfacing (paths, paving, concrete, gravelled areas, drives and hard standings) in front gardens for the parking of private motor vehicles which retain or create sufficient soft 'green' landscaping (grass, flower beds, shrubs, trees and hedges) and a sufficient length of hedgerow (if applicable) along the frontage of the property to reduce the visual prominence of parked vehicles. The council will aim to ensure that a significant proportion, around 50% of the frontage is retained as landscaped 'greenery' to retain the appearance and ethos of the garden city unless individual circumstances indicate that this would not be appropriate,.

The space for a single hard standing for a car must be no less than 4.8 x 2.4m and this policy also applies to side gardens facing either open space, footpaths or roads.

In assessing applications for hardstandings that may not retain a balance of hard and soft landscaping, or involve removal of a hedge or landscaping beyond the minimum required to access the hardstanding and therefore are considered to be contrary to policy EM4.

The application proposes altering the boundary treatment to the front of the dwelling by repositioning the existing hedgerow from the front to the side boundary line which is shared with the neighbouring property no. 25 Archers Ride. The existing hedge appears to be shared by both neighbouring properties with an equal portion along both the property's frontages. Given the prominent setting, the proposed loss of the hedgerow and its repositioning to the side boundary would have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the area.

For this reason the proposal does have a detrimental impact on the character of the immediate streetscene to the extent to warrant a refusal. It is therefore considered that the proposal would fail to maintain and enhance the amenities and values of the Garden City.

Additionally the frontages of dwellings within the immediate streetscene (block of three terraced dwellings) are characterised by boundary treatment hedgerows to the front and timber fencing to the sides. In this context the proposed alterations would appear to alter the established character of the area and would not sufficiently retain the distinctive frontages of Archers Ride. It is therefore not considered to be in keeping with the appearance and ethos of this part of the garden city. So whilst the applicant has concerns with parking on the street and the hedgerow interrupting visibility such concerns do not outweigh the impact to the amenities and values of the Garden City.

In relation to the impact on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers the impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings is measured in terms of the impact on neighbouring properties access to day/sun/sky light, overshadowing, loss of privacy/overlooking and impact on outlook. Given the nature of the proposal it is not considered that it would be detrimental to the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers.

**8. CONCLUSION:**

It is considered that the proposal fails to maintain and enhance the amenities and values of the Garden City and is therefore not compliant with the Estate Management Scheme.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL**

1. The proposal, by reason of the loss of a mature hedgerow to the front site boundary and repositioning to the side boundary, fails to reflect the appearance and design of landscaped frontages within the immediate streetscene, and detracts from the character and appearance of the property, streetscene and local area. The proposal therefore does not comply with policy EM3 of the Estate Management Scheme.

**REFUSED PLAN NUMBER(S):**

Site Location Plan and Block Plan and Existing Plan and Proposed Plan received and dated 19 October 2015.

**Signature of author**.....J.Wharwood..... **Date**.....02/12/2015.....